THEOLOGY

VOL. LV SEPTEMBER, 1952 No. 387

The Dead Sea Scrolls

THE Biblical and other Hebrew manuscripts discovered in 1947 in a cave at the north-western end of the Dead Sea, two and a half miles to the north of 'Ain Feshkha, have been the subject of the liveliest debate, and views as to their age, interpretation, and significance differ widely. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*,[1] which is a translation, and an excellent one, made by Miss E. Margaret Rowley, of his *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, published in 1950, Professor Dupont-Sommer gives an account of their discovery and of their contents, provides original translations of a number of the texts, and expounds his views as to their date, the circle to which they belonged, and their importance for Old and New Testament study.

In the manuscript known as the *Habakkuk Commentary*, which is entirely allegorical in character, Professor Dupont-Sommer sees a historical source of the first importance for the study of the Jewish background at the time when it was composed. He fixes his attention especially upon an allusion in it to an exceptionally heavy divine punishment which came upon the people of Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement. The catastrophe to which allusion is made he believes to be the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C. The *Commentary* must therefore have been composed after this date. He thinks there is evidence in it for a date after the second triumvirate in which Octavius, Antony, and Lepidus were associated in 43 B.C., and he regards 41 B.C. as the most likely date for the composition of the work.

The sect to which the author of the *Commentary* belonged was founded by the "Master of Justice", who bore the title "Elect of God". The community was called the "Covenant", or more exactly the "New Covenant". The members of it were the "poor" and "simple". The anonymous founder, who was held in great veneration, was a priest; he received revelations which he was commissioned to communicate to the Jews; he made disciples, and demanded from them strict observance of the Jewish law. He was in bitter conflict with the priesthood of Jerusalem. He was indeed persecuted and tortured by the "Wicked Priest", who is to be identified with Aristobulus II (67–63 B.C.). Some of the passages which refer to the "Wicked Priest" refer, however, to Hyrcanus II, who succeeded Aristobulus II in 63 B.C. The commentator wrote under the belief that the last Judgment was at hand. The divine founder of the "New Covenant", though dead, lives on, and is expected by his followers to return. Meanwhile his faithful ones remain together in the com-

[1] Published by Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1952. Pp. 100. Plates 10. A few modifications of the French text have been introduced into the English edition.

munity he founded. In the *Manual of Discipline*, another of the manuscripts found in the cave, are preserved the rules in accordance with which the religious and moral life of the community was to be conducted.

It is now generally agreed that the *Damascus Document*—discovered as long ago as 1896 by S. Schechter, who published the two manuscripts of it, dated in the tenth and twelfth centuries respectively, in 1910—is connected with the Dead Sea scrolls, and that the two sets of documents emanate from the same group and are mutually explanatory. Professor Dupont-Sommer finds references again in the *Damascus Document* to Pompey and to Hyrcanus II, and he assigns the composition of it to more or less the same date as the composition of the *Habakkuk Commentary*. Shortly before Pompey's capture of Jerusalem, the community of the "New Covenant" left Judaea on account of persecution, and transferred its seat to Damascus. The community was still there when the *Damascus Document* was written, but most of its members returned to Judaea when the political situation changed, probably when Herod the Great came to the throne (37 B.C.). In the *Damascus Document* the "Master" is given many titles. One especially deserves notice—namely, "Anointed One"—that is, "Messiah" or "Christ". The "Master" will return "at the end of the days", a time which is thought to be not very far off. Something like "a trinitarian theology" is met with—"God, the Anointed One of God, the Spirit of God, such are the three great divine entities in the sect of the New Covenant" (p. 65). It is in the light of the new spirit and the new doctrines which may be traced in these documents that the *Psalms of Thanksgiving*, also found in the cave, have to be read—they express "all the feelings of adoration, joy, and gratitude of those who have been converted and have entered into the Covenant" (p. 79).

The manuscripts were, according to Professor Dupont-Sommer, concealed in the cave by the followers of the "New Covenant", when they were forced to leave Judaea owing to the political dangers of *c.* A.D. 66–70. These followers of the "New Covenant" are identified with the Essenes. A number of writings, which were formerly thought possibly to be of Essene origin, can now be connected with the sect of the "New Covenant"—works such as *Jubilees*, the *Apocalypse of Lamech*, *Enoch*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Assumption of Moses*, and the *Psalms of Solomon*. And of passages like Daniel 9, Zechariah 12. 10–14, Psalm 22, and above all the Servant Songs in Second Isaiah, Professor Dupont-Sommer writes—"how is it possible to avoid asking whether the person indicated is not precisely our Master of Justice?" (p. 96). In the first century B.C. Judaism "saw a whole theology of the suffering Messiah, of a Messiah who should be the redeemer of the world, developing around the person of the Master of Justice" (ibid.). Everything in the Jewish New Covenant "prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant. The Galilean Master, as he is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, appears in many respects as an astonishing reincarnation of the Master of Justice" (p. 99). As a result of the clearer

undertanding of the historical *milieu* which these documents provide "Jesus and the nascent Christian church will find themselves more firmly rooted in history" (p. 100).

This brief survey of Professor Dupont-Sommer's views will, it is hoped, have indicated sufficiently the interest and challenge of his book. He argues his case with brilliance and with uncommon insight. Whether his views are correct or not, however, only the future can show. For it must be stressed that his thesis is only one competing with others. As regards the dating of the manuscripts, for example, there are scholars who would assign them, not to the first century B.C., but to the preceding century; while others again think that they find their proper setting in the early centuries of the Christian era. Opinions are not wanting indeed which favour a medieval date. The dating of the manuscripts must, of course, carry with it consequences for the identification of persons and groups of persons. Thus the "Wicked Priest" has been identified with others besides Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II—for example, with the Hasmonean priest-king, Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 B.C.). Further, the identification of the sect with the Essenes, although it is recognized that it has much to be said for it, is felt by some scholars to be not free of difficulty. Indeed, Professor Dupont-Sommer himself is aware of some of the difficulties. Moreover, it is held by some that the entry of Pompey into Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement still needs to be established as a historical fact, even if Professor Dupont-Sommer's exegesis of the relevant passage in the *Habakkuk Commentary* is justified, which is denied by some. Thus on these four points—to mention no others—which are central to Professor Dupont-Sommer's thesis, entirely different views can be, and are, held by other scholars.

One of the chapters of the book is devoted to the two scrolls of Isaiah. One, which belongs to St Mark's monastery in Jerusalem, has been published in full. Of the other, which belongs to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, only two columns have so far been published. The text of the scrolls is substantially the same as that of the Massoretic text, but the St Mark's scroll is strikingly different from it both in its orthography and in the many variants which it contains. Some of the variants, it is interesting to note, confirm conjectural emendations which have been proposed. When Professor Dupont-Sommer writes of the Isaiah manuscripts that "they give us a Hebrew text for a very large part of the Bible which is centuries earlier than the Massoretic text" (p. 20), he is stating a view with which the great majority of scholars agree. Indeed, it may be said that there is a greater measure of agreement among scholars upon this one point than upon any other point of discussion in connexion with the scrolls. From the welter of conflicting opinions this is the one essential, solid fact which emerges, and which gives to the manuscripts a unique significance. These Isaiah manuscripts may be viewed as specimens of text forms which circulated before the period of the Massoretes, and which survived their efforts to suppress all traces of other texts which did not conform to the standard text which it was their object to produce. How far back we may carry this

earlier witness to the tradition which lies behind the Massoretic text form is, however, as has been said, a matter of debate. Professor Dupont-Sommer thinks that the writing of the Isaiah scrolls indicates that they belong to the first century B.C. He recognizes, however, that the argument from palaeography is as little decisive for dating as is the argument from the date of the jars found with the manuscripts in the cave, whether these be of Hellenistic, or later, date. So long as precise dating eludes us, it will not be possible properly to appreciate the significance of the variant readings in the Isaiah texts—and it is the significance of a variant reading, and not merely the fact of its occurrence, which is all important. The identification of the sect to which these texts belonged is hardly less important for this purpose.

Since scholars differ so widely in their views concerning the date and significance of the Dead Sea scrolls, it is premature to assert the correctness of one view against another. It must be emphasized that not all the manuscripts which have been found have been published. More than this, it is not yet known for certain how many manuscripts exist. If all the jars found in the cave—there may have been forty or more—contained manuscripts, there must be many, very many, more manuscripts somewhere. And latterly have come reports of new discoveries, both of an archaeological and literary character. It would be rash therefore to dogmatize on the basis of so uncertain and incomplete information. It must be confessed that it is not easy to see how the great divergency of views which now prevails may be removed along the present lines of discussion. It may be that some progress might be made if enthusiasms could cool a little, and if there were a readiness to abandon positions rigidly taken up when the evidence appeared to justify it. It is a most welcome feature of Professor Dupont-Sommer's stimulating book that he knows that his translations of the texts and his exposition of them will need to be modified as research proceeds. An enormous literature upon the scrolls, written in many languages, has already grown up, and fresh views are constantly being put forward. It is not too much to say, however, that we have hardly begun to understand the significance of these remarkable ancient texts. We have still a long way to go before we can feel that we are treading on sure ground. The palaeographical, orthographical, archaeological, linguistic, interpretative, and other problems involved will not easily or quickly be solved. In the meantime we shall be well advised to be slow to accept as final any view concerning them that may be advanced.

D. Winton Thomas.

Some Reflections on Christian Unity[1]

That world events are pressing upon Christians the need to present a united front against vast hostile forces is now a familiar

[1] The substance of a sermon preached before the University of Oxford on 15 June 1952.

fact. Because we believe that the events of history are under the providence of God, we must recognize that the pressure of those events is the pressure of God's hand. The divine pressure is surely moving us to examine anew the principles which must govern our beliefs about the Church and Ministry, and to distinguish afresh what are and what are not the fundamentals upon which unity is to be achieved.

It is the purpose of this article first to suggest that certain elements in the work and teaching of Christ have a priority and permanence which must not be sacrificed for the sake of doctrines which are secondary and reformable: and secondly to suggest certain attitudes of mind and practical actions which in the writer's opinion should follow from them.

I. (*a*) Jesus came to proclaim and inaugurate the Kingdom of God. Any kingdom is a set of relationships—the relationship between sovereign and subject, and between subject and subject. The character of that relationship is determined by the character of the sovereign. Because God is Love, his Kingdom is the perfected state of relationships of Love. The two great commandments are the Law of the Kingdom—the Law of Love of God and of neighbour, of unity with our Father and our brethren. His Kingdom for which we continually pray is the establishment of the unity of mankind in the common love of God.

Unity is the eternal purpose of God for man. Fellowship, community, universal brotherhood—these are not characteristics of human life which have been, as it were, added to an original individualism. Rather they are the basic truth about man's nature which has been obscured and denied by man's sin. Is not disunity the sin of the world in its collective form, while self-centredness is the same sin in the individual. Self-centredness, as opposed to God-centredness, in each of us, quickly becomes separation from our neighbours except at points at which our individual selfishnesses become, for shorter or longer periods, communal ones: and then one self-centred group sets itself in rivalry against another self-centred group. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Here is the fundamental sin which he has lived, died, and risen to take away—self-centredness from the individual, disunity from mankind.

(*b*) The Church is the beginning of the return of mankind to that state of unity which is the eternal purpose of God. She is sent forth with Christ's message to the world—of forgiveness of its fundamental sins of self-centredness and disunity, of the possibility here and now of fellowship in Christ, and of the universal and unifying Love of God by acceptance of which can men be saved from self-destructive strife. Christ said that this message would be believed and accepted only if its proclamation were accompanied by its practical demonstration. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye love one another." "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

(*c*) On a certain occasion the disciples came to Jesus confidently

expecting to receive his commendation. They had come across a man who was casting out devils in their Master's name and yet was not one who had attached himself to the little company who followed Jesus. With righteous indignation at such presumption, they had told this unauthorized worker in the Name of Jesus not to act in this way again. They reported their action to the Lord confident that he would approve it. It must have been a shock to them to discover that he did nothing of the sort. He pointed straight to fundamentals. "Was this man whom you have suppressed doing a piece of work for me or against me? On your own admission he was casting out devils. Is that a good or a bad thing to do? You were wrong to stop him. 'He that is not against us is on our part.'" Two verses later our Lord is recorded as saying, "Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone be hanged about his neck and he were cast into the sea." If we are right in supposing that the "little one" in our Lord's mind is the man whom the disciples had refused to acknowledge as a fellow worker, the force of his rebuke is greatly increased.

(*d*) "He that is not with me is against me." The context is the suggestion of his opponents that Jesus casts out devils through Beelzebub. This is a refusal to recognize the Holy Spirit's work, and is to attribute it to Satan. The work was manifestly good and therefore of God. Satan cannot stand if divided against himself. No more can God. Between God and Satan, between Christ and Beelzebub, between good and evil, there can be no compromise. Men are on one side or the other: either against him or for him. His opponents drew on themselves his condemnation because they recognized a good deed and yet refused to acknowledge its doer.

(*e*) It is submitted that from the above we are provided with three primary principles which should govern our thoughts and actions in the quest for Christian unity.

i. That Christ came into the world to save men from the fundamental sin of disunity by drawing them into his own life and so into fellowship with each other.

ii. That he condemned any separation between those who believe on him and do his work.

iii. That he warned us against any refusal to recognize the Holy Spirit when he chooses to manifest himself in persons or in circumstances which seem to us unexpected.

II. In the light of these considerations the disunity of Christendom looks black indeed. The Church itself is riddled with the very disunity which is the sin of the world and for which it is the Church's task to proclaim the remedy. Even as we proclaim our message we are painfully aware that we have no defence against the world's retort—"Physician, heal thyself."

One way in which some Christian communities endeavour to escape from this dilemma is by claiming that that particular community is in fact the only Church. In making such a claim it seems that they are in danger of taking up the attitude of the disciples which Christ condemned. They come perilously near forbidding

other Christians to cast out devils because they are not of what they consider to be the chosen band. We must be fair at this point to those who claim this exclusive right to be "the Church", and note that they thankfully admit that the Grace of God is indeed manifested in uncovenanted ways and unexpected places. Once that admission has been made we are faced with the root problem about Christian unity. If we recognize the work of the Holy Spirit in those from whom we are separated, can we deny that we are one with them in Christ? If we are one in Christ, how is that unity to be expressed and manifested to the world?

To-day most Christians agree that in the design of God, the Church, which is the first beginnings of the Kingdom in the visible world, is to be a visible recognizable society. That this is now common ground among Christians is in itself great gain. Yet divisions which have persisted for so many centuries cannot be cured in a hurry, any more than a man can overcome bad habits all at once, even after he has repented of them. Is not much of our disunity the result of bad habits, bad ecclesiastical habits? Are we not right in questioning the habit, established so early in the Church's history, of excommunication of any who held an opinion on a matter of faith or morals which was held to be unorthodox? Often the alleged heterodoxy was probably more linguistic than doctrinal, and reflected another mode of thought unfamiliar to those in authority. Often the divergence was due to political causes, and the parties to an unedifying dispute used the machinery of ecclesiastical separation for political ends.

Again, a theological or ecclesiastical defect has often arisen through the impossibility of avoiding it in the circumstances of the time. For example, lack of episcopal order was not always due to disbelief in the value and place of the office of the bishop, but to the physical impossibility of its maintenance. A modern instance of this is to be found in the Finnish Church.

It is not, of course, suggested that the present differences of doctrine are all to be traced to such beginnings, and that there are indeed no real and deep convictions which divide us. But the age-long habit of separation, of excommunication, has deepened and perpetuated those differences. Was, and is, that habit of separation necessary? Is it calculated to promote the unity which our Lord wills? And how are we to reconcile it with his condemnation of the disciples' parallel action already referred to?

The following points are submitted for consideration as tending towards that which we are all agreed is God's will—the Unity of his Church and ultimately of all mankind.

1. All Christians and all Christian communions are called to penitence in this matter. It is impossible for any body of Christians to claim exception from this. None is without fault—faults of pride, exclusiveness, superiority, past violence, lack of Christian love.

2. Penitence involves amendment of a positive kind. For pride we must substitute Christ-like humility, competition only in the washing of each other's feet: for superiority, willingness to learn

from each other: for exclusiveness, a continual search for every opportunity to remove barriers: for past violence and lack of charity, constant desire for each other's welfare and mutual prayer.

3. The Church, the People of God, the Israel of God, the Family in Christ, consists of those who share the life of Christ by Faith, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. These are marks of the Church which are indisputably dominical. Whatever differences divide Christians within that fellowship, we are yet one Family, one Body—shoots on the one Vine, the Church. Our task is to manifest its visible identity to the world. It is said theoretically that the Church cannot be divided, but the hard fact is that externally it is.

4. Unity of which the biological simile of an organism can be used is that in which there is one common principle of life. Are we not sharers of the life of Christ through the Holy Spirit with all baptized Christians? Are we not therefore already in an organic unity with them? Christians are organically united after the inward man; our divisions arise as to the outward bodily form. It is not organic unity which we lack, but suitable expression of it.

5. Almost all Christian communities agree that the Ministry is essential, and indeed is the appointment and gift of the Lord himself, since he chose and trained the Apostles and commanded them earnestly to feed his flock. Yet it is about this that the most stubborn differences exist. Over many centuries and to this day in the Anglican, Orthodox, and Roman Churches the Ministry has been maintained in the form of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, the Bishop being regarded as the essential successor to the Apostles, from whom the other orders derive their ministry by delegation. In the Anglican Church there is a variety of theories of the Episcopate, though acceptance of the fact of it is our common bond. This acceptance is enshrined in the ordinal where it is required in the Preface that ordination shall be "by publick Prayer with imposition of Hands". It is clear from the Forms of Making of Deacons, of Ordering of Priests, and Consecration of Bishops, that the Hands referred to are those of the Bishop or Bishops: and also that no other particular theory of episcopacy is insisted upon, though the functions of each order are described. The Orthodox Church shares the Anglican insistence on the Imposition of Episcopal Hands, but lays even more stress upon orthodoxy of faith. In their view true ministry is primarily authenticated by "continuing in the Apostles' doctrine". In the Church of Rome, the essential office appears to be that of the priest, rather than the bishop: the bishop being super-priest with authority to govern and ordain. The office of Bishop or Superintendent exists in other churches, but is very variously regarded. In some churches where bishops are found, there seems to be no theory that the bishop is essential for ordination. Yet their function is by no means wholly administrative and they occupy a position of pastoral direction and leadership.

In some non-episcopal churches, the minister seems to be thought of as the minister of the local congregation rather than of the whole church. This is not by any means always so. For instance, in the

Presbyterian Church of Scotland there is the strongest belief in the continuity of the Orders of the Ministry, and that it is part of the Ministry of the Catholic Church. Presbyterians claim that the jurisdiction of the bishop is over the local congregation rather than a diocese, and that in that sense each Parish Minister is a bishop. In support of this view they point to the interchangeability of the terms presbyter and bishop in the New Testament. These familiar facts of the present situation have been here summarized in order to show how diverse are the forms and theories of the Ministry, while belief in its necessity is well-nigh universal.

6. Let us put side by side with all this the principles referred to in the first part of this article. Ought this matter of the form of the Ministry, about which even among episcopalians such widely different opinions are held, to have priority over the spiritual reality of our unity about which we are all agreed? At the foot of the Cross we are united. At the altar, where we commemorate the Cross, we cannot express that unity. Which of these places of devotion is to have priority? Is not the Ministry being given a disproportionate place in our relationship with God in Christ and with our brethren?

7. The greatest obstacle to the acceptance of episcopacy by those who are not in Episcopal Orders is the fear that such acceptance involves the denial of the reality of their present ministries. For the sake of the unity of the Church there ought to be mutual forbearance and understanding at this point. Episcopacy will win acceptance out of its own merit and truth—provided it is exercised and presented with the utmost humility and charity, and without pressing its claims with a rigid logic which is not always our best guide in spiritual matters. Episcopalians who deny validity to other ministries should ponder again Christ's rebuke to the disciples—"He that is not against us is on our part." On that occasion the efficacy of the man's work in the Name of Jesus was unquestionable and our Lord refused to declare it invalid. Acceptance of episcopacy by those now in other ministries ought not to involve the denial of the reality of their present ministries. In the writer's opinion we should invite them to accept for the future the principle of episcopal ordination as being the outward and visible sign of the act of the Church in ordaining which has most commonly been so accepted for the greater part of Christian history. We are already sharers of the life of Christ with our separated brethren. Are we to make that a matter of secondary importance to, and dependent upon, a particular form of Ministry? St Paul teaches us that "there is one body and one Spirit".[1] He goes on to declare that Christ gave the Ministry—in a variety of forms—"for the building up of the body of Christ till we, all of us together, reach oneness in faith".[2] The Church does not depend on the Ministry nor the Ministry on the Church. Both depend on the will and action of Christ, and by his will are essential to each other.

8. Too long have rival theories about the gift of the Ministry to

[1] Eph. 4. 4.
[2] Eph. 4. 12 and 13. (*The New Testament: A New Translation in Plain English.*)

the Church resulted in what Christ wills to be a means of building up becoming a principal cause of division. The Holy Spirit is leading us into all truth. Are we to believe that at some date in past history he settled for ever the form in which that truth is to be embodied, and particularly the form of the Ministry? If so, at what date? "He will lead you into all truth" is our Lord's promise about him. He will lead us together. Rivalries, jealousies, misunderstandings, human sin, have divided the Body of Christ—have fragmented his Church: and he does not guide one fragment in isolation from the rest. There are wide differences between us upon doctrinal matters of deep importance of which the Ministry is only one. But it is together, not in separation, that he will lead us to that knowledge of the Truth to which he wills to bring us.

In conclusion, it is very important that thought and action on the lines suggested should be corporate and not individual. No progress will be made on the path towards unity by free-lance activity by individuals which flouts the present laws and customs of the Church to which they belong. If there is any value in the suggestions here made, the first step is to convert the opinion of one's own Church to their acceptance. Corporate action can then be taken by due authority within that Church. Individual lawlessness leads only to further division. Action for Christians must be corporate at every stage. We are called to-day to give ourselves to constant prayer and fearless thought on this vital subject so that we may not be found to fight against God, but be more ready instruments of his Will to unite all mankind in Christ.

KENNETH EDENBURGEN:

Is St Thomas's Eucharistic Theology Adequate?

THE strong points of St Thomas's Eucharistic theology are so obvious as hardly to need mention. His clear recognition that the Eucharist, while it is a real sacrifice, does not involve a literal slaying of the divine victim, and his insistence that the Eucharistic presence, while it is a real presence, is not a crudely material one which would subject the ascended Saviour to the limitations of spatio-temporal existence, have been of quite inestimable importance, and it can be plausibly argued that many of the defects from which subsequent Eucharistic theology has suffered are due not to the extent to which the main direction of the Angelic Doctor's teaching has been followed but to the extent to which it has been ignored or abandoned. Nevertheless I shall suggest that in some respects St Thomas's discussion of the Eucharist is inadequate, and I shall not feel that in doing so I am casting any slur upon his greatness. St Thomas, while he towers above his age, is none the less a child of his age, and we lesser children of a later age, while we shall have our own defects which may very well be greater than his, are not on the whole likely

[1] A paper read to the Oxford University Aquinas Society.

to have the same ones. We are in a better position than he was in to see where he was wrong, even if we must leave it to our successors to perform the same service for us.

I. It is impossible to glance at St Thomas's treatment of the Eucharist in either the *Contra Gentiles* or the *Summa Theologica* without recognizing how very much the question of the Eucharistic Presence predominates in his thought over the question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. This fact, which he shares with other medieval theologians, does not, of course, mean that either St Thomas or medieval Christians in general had any doubts that the Eucharist was a sacrifice; the whole elaborate system of requiems and chantries is sufficient to show this. It may well be that St Thomas treats the Eucharistic Sacrifice so sketchily precisely because everyone believed in it; it was only under the pressure of the Protestant denials that the Catholic theologians of the Counter-reformation gave it such a detailed—and, we may add, such a wrong-headed—discussion. Nor does the emphasis upon the Presence mean that medieval religion was centred in the reception of holy communion; communion, except for the clergy, was, as we all know, lamentably infrequent. What medieval religion was centred in, so far as the Mass was concerned, was adoration. It was to see the host and to adore it that the people came to Mass; the concentration of medieval Eucharistic theology upon the Presence is the natural reflection of this.

It has, in contrast, come to be more and more fully realized in recent times that a balanced discussion of the Eucharist must start from the Sacrifice and must see the Presence in relation to this; such works as those of de la Taille, Dix, and Masure provide outstanding examples of this approach. That is to say, we must not look upon the Mass as primarily a means of manufacturing the Body and Blood of Christ, which are then to be used for the three more or less parallel purposes of adoration, sacrifice, and communion. Rather we must look upon the Mass as primarily the Christian Sacrifice, which, just because it is a sacrifice, requires the presence of the victim, who being present is rightly adored and who by being received in communion imparts to the faithful the benefits of redemption and unites them with himself in the Mystical Body which is the Church. St Thomas would of course deny none of these truths, and indeed they can all be found expressed in his writings. But what we are concerned with is a question of emphasis, and I think it must be admitted that St Thomas places his emphasis upon the Presence rather than upon the Sacrifice, and that in consequence, while his discussion of the Presence is elaborated to the last degree, his discussion of the Sacrifice is brief and almost perfunctory.

The notion of sacrifice in general is treated by St Thomas not in the *Pars Tertia* when dealing with the Eucharist, but in the *Secunda Secundae* under the virtue of justice. Sacrifice is included in the practice of religion, and religion is a duty arising out of the cardinal virtue of justice: justice, that is, towards God, *giving God his due.* And, as Masure has stressed in his book *The Christian Sacrifice,* St Thomas's definition is extremely general and does not include as a

necessary element the death or the destruction of the object offered. "There are sacrifices properly so called", he writes, "when something happens in connexion with things offered to God, as when animals were slain or when bread is broken and eaten and blessed. And the very name shows this, for 'sacrifice' is derived from a man making something holy."[1] When in the *Pars Tertia* St Thomas discusses whether Christ's passion was a sacrifice he tells us that "a sacrifice properly so called is something done that is properly due to God for his honour to appease him",[2] and goes on to quote the famous remark of St Augustine that "a true sacrifice is every work which is performed in order that in holy fellowship we may cleave to God, that is, which is related to that end of goodness in which alone we can be truly blessed". Now Christ, he goes on, "offered himself in suffering for us, and this very work, that he voluntarily bore suffering, was in the highest degree accepted by God, inasmuch as it proceeded from charity. Hence", he concludes, "it is manifest that the passion of Christ was a true sacrifice."[3] It seems difficult to find very much fault with St Thomas's doctrine of sacrifice as such, or of the sacrifice of Christ. While he recognizes that, in a sinful world and as a redemption for human sin, Christ's sacrifice could fittingly operate only by means of his death (though he does not deny that, absolutely speaking, God might have redeemed mankind in some other way[4]), he emphasizes the centrality of the fact that Christ's death was above all else a manifestation of his charity. Christ's passion was a satisfaction for our sins, he tells us, "in the first place, on account of the greatness of the charity from which he suffered. . . . The charity of the suffering Christ was greater than the malice of those who crucified him."[5] When, however, he goes on to discuss in what sense the Eucharist is a sacrifice and what is its relation to the Passion, his language becomes somewhat vague. The Eucharist is "commemorative of the Lord's Passion"[6]; it is "something representative of the Lord's passion"[7]; it is "a reminder (*rememorativum*) of the Passion which is past"[8]; it is "a memorial of the Lord's passion"[9]; and so on. St Thomas is, of course, quite clear that the Eucharist is a sacrifice; he says explicitly that it "is not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice".[10] But how is it a sacrifice? "It is called a sacrifice inasmuch as it represents the very passion of Christ."[11] What are we to understand by these ambiguous words, *commemorative, reminder, memorial, representative*? Not, it is frequently said, what Protestants would understand by them: these words do not imply a bare imitation or dramatic performance which merely imitates a past event. Does not the Angelic Doctor quote with approval Augustine's words that Christ is immolated every day in the sacrament?[12] Yes, indeed. But does he not also add, again quoting Augustine, that this is because "the images of things are called by the names of the things of which they are images, *as when we look upon a picture or fresco and say*

[1] *S. Theol.*, II II, lxxxv, 3 *ad* 3. [2] Ibid., III, xlviii, 3*c*. [3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., xlvi, 2. [5] Ibid., xlviii, 2 *c et ad* 2. [6] Ibid., lxxiii, 4*c*.
[7] Ibid., 5*c*. [8] Ibid. [9] Ibid., lxxiv, 1*c*. [10] Ibid., lxxxii, 4*c*.
[11] Ibid., lxxiii, 4 *ad* 3. [12] Ibid., lxxxiii, 1 *sed contra*.

'That is Cicero' "?[1] And does he not also say that, "when Christ was going to leave his disciples in his proper species, he left himself with them in the sacramental species, *as the Emperor's image is set up to be venerated in his absence*"?[2] I am not, of course, suggesting that St Thomas did not believe in the real presence; "this sacrament . . .", he writes, "is called a victim *inasmuch as it contains Christ,* who is the victim of sweetness";[3] and he devotes two questions to discussing transubstantiation. But, clear as he is that in the Mass the divine *victim* is really present, is he equally clear that the *sacrifice* of Christ is really present? He does of course quote with approval the words of the Secret for the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost: "As often as the commemoration of this victim is celebrated, the work of our redemption is exercised", but he explicitly interprets this as meaning simply that "by this sacrament we are made sharers in the fruits of the Lord's passion".[4] What I am in fact suggesting is that St Thomas was rightly anxious to avoid any suggestion that there is in the Mass a literal slaying of Christ, a literal repetition of Calvary, and that in consequence he took refuge in the rather vague notion of the Mass as a commemoration, representation, or memorial of the Passion. I do not suggest that for him these words had a merely psychological significance, as they have had for the majority of Protestants. St Thomas was quite clear that Christ is really present in the Mass, and that by the Mass the fruits of the Passion are communicated to the Church and to the faithful. But what, in his anxiety to avoid a crude immolationism, he did not, so far as I can see, manage to achieve was an equally clear realization that the Mass is really and not merely figuratively a sacrifice. To say this is not to blame him for anything that he could very well have avoided; it is merely to say that he could not do in the thirteenth century what de la Taille, Vonier, and Masure in conjunction managed, at least in principle, to do in the twentieth. What I suggest was the fundamental cause of this deficiency was an inadequate understanding of the nature of a sacrament.

A sacrament, St Thomas tells us, is a sign, but not every sign is a sacrament. A sacrament is "a sign of a holy thing in so far as it makes men holy".[5] It is a sensible thing, and it requires words for its signification.[6] Furthermore, the sacraments of the New Dispensation contain and confer grace and derive their power from the Passion of Christ.[7] They are instrumental causes of spiritual effects, and therefore, since God is their principal agent, they can be instituted by no one other than God himself.[8] All this is excellent, as far as it goes, but what we miss in St Thomas is anything like an adequate discussion of the peculiar type of instrumental causality which a sacrament exercises. "There is in a sacrament", says St Thomas, " a certain instrumental power for producing the sacramental effect",[9] but I do not find him giving anything like an adequate discussion of the way in which sacramental causality acts. I hasten to add that I am not

[1] Ibid., lxxxiii, 1*c*.
[2] Ibid., lxxiii, 5*c*.
[3] Ibid., lxxiii 4 *ad* 3.
[4] Ibid., lxxxiii, 1*c*.
[5] Ibid., lx, 2*c*.
[6] Ibid., 5, 6.
[7] Ibid., lxii, 3, 4, 5.
[8] Ibid., lxiv, 2.
[9] Ibid., lxii, 4*c*.

concerned with that burning question of the schools, whether sacramental causality is physical or moral. Whatever the answer may be to that question, the fundamental question remains: how does sacramental causality differ from non-sacramental causality? If sacramental causality is physical, how does it differ from other physical causality? If it is moral, how does it differ from other moral causality? What precisely is involved in the fact that it is sacramental, that it operates in the manner of a *sacrament*, that is, in the manner of a *sign*? How does a sacramental sign differ from any other divine instrument?

It was, in my opinion, the great merit of Abbot Vonier, in his book *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, to realize the truth (I am expressing it in my words, not in his) that the difference between sacramental and non-sacramental causality is not a physical or a moral difference, but a metaphysical one. Sacramental causality is, of course, supernatural, but not all supernatural causality is sacramental. "If", writes Vonier, "the priest at the altar brought down Christ from heaven in his natural state as a full-grown man, this would not be a sacrament in the least, as it would lack the very essence of the sacrament, representative signification. . . . The sacramental world is a new world created by God, entirely different from the world of nature and even from the world of spirits. . . . Sacraments are a new creation with entirely new laws."[1] That is to say (and here again I am using my own words), sacramental signs do not make present the realities which they signify by spatially enclosing them, in the way in which a gas-cylinder may contain hydrogen, or by being instruments by which they are manufactured, as a sausage-machine produces sausages, or by being channels through which they are communicated, as a water-pipe delivers water, but by being divinely ordained efficacious signs of them. The word "efficacious" is, of course, fundamental. Sacraments are not signs of realities which are absent, but signs of realities which are present; and the means by which, as instrumental causes, they make the realities present is by being signs ordained by God. Applying these considerations to the Eucharist, we are not left merely with the alternatives of either viewing the Eucharist as some kind of physical *repetition* of the Passion of Christ or, on the other hand, of viewing it as nothing more than (in the modern sense of the word) a *commemoration* of the Passion. Nor should we regard it, as de la Taille and Spens tended to do, as a kind of complement of the Passion, without which the Passion, as a sacrifice, would not be complete. To put the matter in another way, the Eucharist is not a new event in the messianic biography, not something which *happens* to the ascended Lord, as we may rightly say that his Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension happened to him. Everything that *happens* in the Eucharist happens either to the eucharistic elements or to the faithful who participate in it, but not to Christ. In consequence, the relation of the Eucharist to the Passion is not to be found in some resemblance, real or fancied, between

[1] Op. cit., pp. 32, 35.

certain characteristics of the Eucharistic rite and certain events of the Passion, whether the fraction, the separate consecration, or anything else, useful as such resemblances may be for purposes of edification and devotion. It consists in the fact that Christ has declared that the bread is his Body and the wine his Blood; that is, in the fact that, by his ordinance and promise, he has made the bread and wine the sacramental signs of the realities which they contain. This, I would maintain, is what establishes the real presence and what constitutes the Mass a real sacrifice. St Thomas was quite clear about the real presence, but I do not think he was equally clear about the real sacrifice; and I have tried to indicate why. I do not suggest that he was wrong to describe the Mass as a commemoration, or a memorial, or a representation of Calvary; our Lord himself commanded that the rite which he instituted at the Last Supper should be done as his *anamnesis*. But I do suggest that St Thomas failed to understand what was involved in the fact that the commemoration, memorial, or representation was a sacramental one. He avoided admirably—as, I think, not all medieval religion managed to avoid—the notion that the Mass is either a separate sacrifice from that of Calvary or a physical repetition of Calvary. He also avoided—as I do not think de la Taille and his followers entirely managed to avoid—the notion that the Mass is something additional to the Passion without which the Passion would not be a sacrifice at all. But I do not think, in spite of all that Vonier tried to do for him, that he altogether managed to avoid the notion, which came to its full expression in the theology of some of the sixteenth-century reformers, that the Mass is simply a divinely appointed commemoration of the Passion, much as he differed from them as to what such a divinely appointed commemoration achieves.

II. I shall now go on to suggest that St Thomas's failure to achieve a full understanding of the nature of sacramental causality has gravely weakened his discussion of the Eucharistic Presence. So long as the discussion is conducted simply in terms of the metaphysical doctrines of Aristotelianism, it is difficult to see how it could lead to any other conclusion than that to which St Thomas actually comes. And he does in fact quite successfully avoid any crude Capharnaite theory about the way in which the Body and Blood of Christ are present under the appearances of bread and wine. The separate consecration of the two elements does not involve a real separation of his Body from his Blood. Under the appearance of bread the Body is present in virtue of the consecration, but the Blood is also present by real concomitance; under the appearance of wine the Blood is present in virtue of the consecration, but the Body is also present by real concomitance.[1] Nor is Christ spatially extended under the sacramental appearances in such a way that part of him is in one part of the host and another part of him in another; he is whole in every part, both before and after the fraction:[2] *tantum esse sub fragmento quantum toto tegitur.*[3] Nor is the Body of Christ

[1] *S. Theol.*, lxxvi, 2. [2] Ibid., 3. [3] *Lauda Sion.*

present in the sacrament in any way locally, nor, strictly speaking, movably.[1] Nor have the elements lost any of their sensible properties, anything that the word "substance" implies in the scientific, as contrasted with the metaphysical, sense.[2] In consequence St Thomas is led to maintain that the accidents of bread and wine, considered as a whole, remain in the sacrament without any subject whatever, being sustained simply by divine power, while he adds that the dimensive quantity (in modern terms, the extensional properties) of the bread and wine acts as a subject of the other accidents.[3] It is at this point that the difficulty arises. For the result is, not merely that the Eucharist is supernatural, but that every Mass is a kind of metaphysical miracle, in which the divine power has to be invoked at each step of the argument in a way which virtually implies that grace does not only perfect nature but destroys it. It can, of course, be said that transubstantiation does not necessarily involve the destruction of the bread and wine, but merely means that, while everything of the bread and wine remains as before, they cease to have the status of substances, since that status is assumed in respect of them by the Body and Blood. It is commonly insisted by scholastic theologians that transubstantiation is not a doctrine of the annihilation of the bread and wine but of their conversion. Nevertheless anyone who has read the discussion of the Eucharistic change in Penido's *Rôle de l'Analogie en Théologie dogmatique* can hardly fail to have noticed how the doctrine of analogy has to be strained to maintain this assertion. The contrast between St Thomas's Eucharistic doctrine and his discussion of the Incarnation is striking in this respect. The difficulty is not that we are here faced with an occurrence which can only be accounted for as the effect of supernatural divine power; everything that happens in the order of grace is that. The difficulty is that we are confronted not with an exemplification or an amplification of our previously accepted metaphysical principles, but with a suspension of them. The fact that this is so does not, of course, provide an argument against the reality of the Eucharistic conversion; but it does suggest that the metaphysical principles which have been employed to describe it are inadequate, that they need, if not to be abandoned, at least to be supplemented.

What I am in fact going to suggest is that they need supplementing by the notion of sacramental signification, considered not merely as a moral or a physical principle but as a metaphysical one. What I mean by this is that we need to invoke the notion of sacramental signification not only in order to describe how the Eucharistic conversion is brought about, or what are its effects after it has been brought about, but also in order to describe what it is. It is not, I suggest, an adequate description of the consecrated elements to say simply that the accidents of bread and wine continue to exist by divine power though the substance of bread and wine is no longer there, while the substance of the Body and of the Blood are there although by divine power their accidents are not manifested. We

[1] *S. Theol.*, lxxvi, 5, 6. [2] Ibid., lxxvii, 3, 6. [3] Ibid., lxxvii, 1, 2.

must add that the substance of the Body and of the Blood are there under the appearance of the bread and of the wine because God has ordained that the bread and wine shall no longer have the status of substance but shall be the sacramental signs of the Body and the Blood. The Body and Blood are there not simply by a direct and unmediated act of the divine power, but by a mediated act of divine power using sacramental causality as secondary cause. The bread and wine are thus not destroyed by ceasing to have the status of substance, nor when they cease to have the status of substance has anything been withdrawn from them. On the contrary, something has been added to them, namely the status of being the sacramental signs of the Body and Blood. The Body and the Blood themselves have not undergone any change by becoming the substance of the Eucharistic gifts, nor have they on the other hand lowered the metaphysical status of the bread and wine by doing so. On the contrary, they have elevated it, for, if sacramental signification is a metaphysical, and not merely a physical or a moral fact, bread and wine have a higher and not a lower metaphysical reality if they have the status of sacramental signs of the Body and Blood of Christ than if they have the status of substance.

It will, I hope, have been clear that I have not introduced this doctrine of sacramental signification as a metaphysical principle in order to contradict anything that St Thomas positively says, but in order to complete it and to save it from metaphysical absurdity. I must add, however, that the introduction of this doctrine does not *necessarily* presuppose the particular explanation of the Eucharistic conversion which St Thomas adopts. But I would submit that any explanation of the Eucharistic conversion which is not to overthrow the nature of a sacrament must in fact take seriously the metaphysical implications of the fact that the Eucharist *is* a sacrament. It will not do simply to describe the Eucharistic conversion in terms which take no account of the fact that the Eucharist is a sacrament and then to introduce this fact as a kind of afterthought; to use it, for example, to explain how the Eucharist is a sacrifice or how the Blessed Sacrament bestows grace when received in communion, if we have not used it previously to explain how the Eucharist exists at all.

When, then, I return to the question which forms the title of this paper, "Is St Thomas's Eucharistic Theology Adequate?", I feel bound to answer "No". In giving this answer, however, I do not mean to imply that in its main assertions his doctrine is demonstrably erroneous, but only that it does not go far enough. Both in his doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice and in his doctrine of the Eucharistic presence he seems to me to have paid far too little attention to the nature of sacramental signification and in consequence to have come up against a brick wall. I need hardly add that I am sure that, if he had paid attention to it, St Thomas would have made much better use of it than I have. But as we could not have him here to read this paper I have had to do the best that I could.

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

Great Preachers—XIX. St Augustine

As a successful rhetorician who had turned Christian Philosopher Augustine was already famed in Africa for his wisdom and eloquence when in 391 he was ordained in Hippo-Regius. It is not surprising, therefore, that his aged bishop should have entrusted him, though only a presbyter, with the task of ministering the Word to his flock, a new thing it seems in the African church. Whether he preached elsewhere during his presbyterate may be uncertain, though he did address the African bishops assembled in Council at Carthage. But when he became a bishop we find him carrying on a vast preaching activity not only in his own diocese but in the churches of Africa, from Carthage, where he was frequently a guest-preacher, to remote Mauritania. Such was his fame, we are told, that crowds gathered to hear him, not only Catholics but heretics too, and, very likely, cultured pagans eager to listen to him as he had once listened to Ambrose, intent upon the manner rather than upon the matter of his discourses. Many sought to secure copies of his sermons, and either took them down as he spoke them or employed notaries to do so. There is therefore a vast mass of material—some 700 sermons passing under his name, in addition to the 124 Tractates or Lectures on St John's Gospel and the bulky Expositions of the Psalms which were also in the main sermons. As many of his popular sermons were simply "spoken" without being written or "dictated", it is a pity that Augustine did not live to produce the emended and authorized edition visualized in the last sentence of the Retractations. He has left to his editors the difficult task of separating the authentic from the spurious.[1]

The fact that Augustine was highly esteemed as a preacher, as also that so much of his output has been preserved, would justify us in regarding him as a great preacher, but, naturally, the effect of his spoken word is less easy to assess than that of his ideas propagated in his major writings. On three occasions we do know that it had an immediate effect. In *Epistle* 29 he gives the outline of three discourses delivered during his Presbyterate in the successful effort to abolish the custom, traditional in Hippo, of drunken revelry associated with the Festival of St Leontius. In the *De Doctrina Christiana* he tells how in Mauritanian Caesarea as the result of a sermon, in which he had spoken with such vehemence of emotion that the congregation forgot to applaud and instead dissolved into tears of repentance, a shockingly barbarous custom was henceforth abandoned. The third occasion was when in a sermon still extant—*De Excidio Urbis*—he comforted his people of Hippo when they were terrified by the news brought to them by fugitives in 410 that Rome had

[1] The best edition remains that of the Benedictines of St Maur, Venice, 1731; reprinted Paris, 1837; containing 397 Sermons and 317 spurious ones in the Appendix. *The Library of the Fathers*, Oxford 1844, contains Sermons on Selected Lessons from the New Testament, 2 vols.; Expositions of the Psalms, 6 vols.; Tractates on St John's Gospel, 2 vols. This last is also in the Edinburgh Edition of Augustine's works, T. and T. Clark, 1873.

fallen, and that Alaric was assembling an invasion fleet with the object of transporting his barbarian hordes to Africa. There were doubtless other occasions when the voice of the preacher was heard with effect, but obviously the bishop of Hippo-Regius would hardly have to meet crises of such world-shaking significance as those which gave to John Chrysostom the opportunity to demonstrate his oratorical power in Antioch and Constantinople.

The greatness of a preacher, however, should be judged by the effects of his work on ordinary people in the ordinary circumstances of their lives. Professor Butterfield has pointed out that "the preaching of the Gospel week in and week out" is "a phenomenon calculated to alter greatly the quality of life, and the very texture of human history", even though it may escape the notice of the historian. Augustine himself stresses the fact that, in contrast to the devotees of pagan religions, Christian congregations "are taught how they must so spend this earthly life as to merit a blessed eternity hereafter . . . Holy Scripture and instruction in righteousness are proclaimed from a high platform in presence of all . . . and though some enter who scoff at such precepts, all their petulance is either quenched by a sudden change or is restrained through fear or shame" (*De Civ. Dei* II 28). Sound popular teaching about faith and righteousness, such as his sermons contain, was, apart from the Cynic enterprise, a new thing in the ancient world, and one cannot doubt that it availed somewhat to comfort and strengthen, sweeten and elevate the common life of his people, especially as it came from one set in authority and highly regarded for his personal worth.

In Book IV of the *De Doctrina Christiana* Augustine has given us a systematic treatment of the principles which he has come to see must guide all Christian preaching. He wrote it in 426, after long experience, and though he claims to be describing an ideal rather than his own practice, his practice does seem to conform to the standard there laid down. All his precepts could be abundantly illustrated from the extant sermons.

In the *Confessions* he has many hard things to say about the art of rhetoric of which he had formerly been an eminent exponent—"selling windy loquacity for a fee". Now he speaks of it more calmly and reasonably. Rhetoric is a mighty instrument for good or evil, and should not be abandoned to the base uses of evil men. The wise and the good should also make use of it in furtherance of their wise and good ends. Wisdom and goodness are certainly to be valued far above mere eloquence, but they can become more effective when they can make use of eloquence. It is true that knowledge of the rules of rhetoric does not make a man an orator, and yet, as they are derived from observation of the practice of good orators, they will be helpful for beginners, and the study of them must be held to be advantageous for youths as part of their formal school education. The more mature, however, and those who have more serious employments would do better to hear good speakers and read their writings and use these as their models. In particular the Christian preacher must not despise rhetoric, though of course he must beware of "eloquent

nonsense". His business is to interpret Holy Scripture, to defend the faith and to oppose error. He will therefore find it to be an advantage to be able to add eloquence to wisdom. In so doing he will be following the example of the Scripture writers. To be sure, the cultured of the day regard these writers as illiterate. Augustine himself had once thought their writings "not to be compared with the Ciceronian eloquence". He still misses in them some of the graces of artistic writing, such as "harmonious endings" which he likes to cultivate himself. But they have an eloquence in which the words match the sense—"wisdom not consciously making eloquence its aim, and eloquence not parting company with wisdom". From Paul and Amos he quotes passages exemplifying a real natural eloquence in which the arts of rhetoric are neither avoided nor obtruded. The Christian preacher, therefore, should make Scripture his first study, not only because the understanding of Scripture brings wisdom, but also because "the riches of Scripture" can enable him to overcome the poverty of his own resources of language. Moreover, if he can adduce Scripture proofs to reinforce what he is saying, that will contribute to his discourse something no less pleasing than profitable.

Augustine's commendation of Scripture as a model of style, in spite of its resemblance to the counsels of some modern literary critics, is surprising, since the Old Latin Version, one supposes, was lacking in the literary quality which distinguishes our Authorized Version. When in his sermons he abandoned the usual rhetorical style for one more plain and bare it was for other reasons than a desire to imitate Scripture, though certainly Scripture phraseology colours his utterance. On the other hand Scripture proofs, often in the form of ingenious allegorization of the text, abound to the almost complete exclusion of other illustrative material. This can hardly mean that he could count on an extensive knowledge of Scripture in his hearers, such as was once common in this country but is found to-day only among small groups. Yet he seems to regard such proofs as an attractive feature of a discourse as they would not be now. At any rate he had the advantage over the modern preacher that no one then questioned the authority of Scripture except the Manichees, whose rather naïve cavillings he was well able to expose. The Bible was to the Churches what Vergil and Cicero were to the schools.

According to Cicero, the aim of the orator was threefold, to teach, to delight, to persuade; to teach so as to instruct, to delight so as to hold the attention, to persuade so as to influence action. All three aims should guide the Christian preacher; but to teach is primary, to make known what is true and good. Here the first requirement is clarity and intelligibility. This is the real reason for Augustine's simplicity and directness of style. He is supremely the teacher. While not countenancing vulgarity he insists on intelligibility even at the sacrifice of pure Latinity if necessary, as when e.g. addressing an African audience. The speaker must watch carefully for the signs that his hearers have grasped his point, and when these are observed he must pass on to another point or else bring his discourse to an

end. The sermons vary greatly in length. Some are very short, lasting possibly a quarter of an hour. He is constantly alive to the danger of wearying his hearers. But some are very long and prolix. Augustine recognizes that it would be inappropriate for a member of the congregation to interrupt the preacher with a question, so he endeavours to answer all possible questions unless he is sure there will be another opportunity to do so. There are indications that he preached at least short series of sermons.

Augustine's preaching seems to have been severely theological and ethical. He makes great demands on the attention of his hearers, and is ever mindful of his own precept that "all words spoken from the pulpit ought to have reference to man's salvation, not temporal but eternal". Even when the subject is so trivial a thing as "a cup of cold water" (Matt. 10. 42) it is to be treated with high seriousness "so that it may inflame the cold hearts of men with zeal to do works of mercy in the hope of an eternal reward". This is a common theme, though actually the text is only used once as an illustration and not as the basis for a sermon. Normally Augustine takes as his starting point a text from one of the Lessons for the day, whether from the Old Testament or from the New, and proceeds directly to show its bearing upon some Christian doctrine or virtue. Naturally some deal in whole or in part with the issues involved in his controversies with the Manichees, the Donatists, the Pelagians, and the pagans. In fact the whole range of orthodoxy in its Augustinian form is expounded, but in a more succinct way than in his major works.

Sometimes the preacher's task will be to move his hearers to do something which they are unwilling to do although they know it to be both right and good. Teaching has done all it can; something more is required to stimulate the will and make it obedient, an appeal to the emotions, to fear or shame, to hope or love, couched in more vehement language that will stir the heart. Augustine has observed, and once at least produced, the effect of powerful eloquence on people shown not so much by clamorous applause as by groans and tears and finally by changed lives. He thinks that occasions for this kind of preaching will be few, for usually it should be sufficient to teach what is true and good. Moreover, it should not be kept up too long as it puts a strain on the hearer and soon loses its effect. It is not easy to point to specific examples of this style of preaching in Augustine's sermons as we have them; but when he is proclaiming the grace of God in Christ, inciting to repentance and humility and setting forth the virtues of faith, hope, and charity, even the bare Latin text cannot wholly conceal the warmth and power of his evangelical message.

As we might expect, Augustine lays much less stress on the pleasure which the orator may give. That had been far too exclusively the aim of rhetoric in his day, to gain applause and nothing more. The Christian preacher is not seeking his own glory or reward, but the glory of God and the kingdom of God. His words are not his own. He ought to pray that God may give him the right message and the right words for the highest profit of those who hear him. And

yet the preacher, mindful of the need of holding attention, may not altogether neglect the aim to give pleasure. Truly eloquent teaching consists in making clear what was obscure, and if this can be done pleasurably it is all the better done. Pleasing must be strictly subordinated to teaching the truth and enforcing virtue; yet if the theme be the praise of God "there is room for beauty and splendour of pleasing language that will tax the orator's powers to the utmost. Again it is not easy to detect this motive at work in Augustine's extant sermons where everything ornamental seems to be rigorously avoided. And yet many a paragraph composed of his usual short sharp sentences will be found to work up to a climax with effect no less pleasing than moving.

When he abandoned his professional rhetoric for the task of preaching the Gospel, Augustine's themes became more real and actual, and his words gained in weight and effectiveness, we may believe, what they lost in artistry. Because of his outmoded method of allegorical interpretation of Scripture, and the absence of illustration from life, his sermons can hardly be made models for to-day, though their simplicity, directness, sincerity, and, above all, their objectivity, are still worthy of imitation; and his homiletic precepts are still valid in the main and could be studied with profit.

JOHN H. S. BURLEIGH.

James Bonnell, Churchman (1653-1699)

"FROM the beginning of my life I had a great sense of piety." That sentence of James Bonnell strikes the persisting note of his life, which in public and in private justified the adjective "exemplary" selected by his biographer William Hamilton.[1] Bonnell's way was the Church's way. As a bishop who knew him from his schooldays observed, "He was a true Son of the Church, and a most exact observer of her Rules and Offices." It is his zealous and thoroughgoing churchmanship producing the kind of religion which his life displayed that makes a study of Bonnell more than a hagiographical saunter in the seventeenth century with the Archdeacon of Armagh as our Walton. For it leads us to consider the basic problem of what sort of religion can be related to the life of the ordinary individual.

James Bonnell, like not a few others of that period who shed lustre on the Church of Ireland, was not an Irishman, but was born in Genoa of English parents in 1653, his father having been long in the Italian trade. In origin, however, the family was not English, for his great-grandfather had been a Protestant refugee at the time of Alva's persecution in the Low Countries, and had made his escape to England, settling at Norwich. Bonnell's father was a man of character and a shrewd merchant, though not so shrewd that he did not liberally assist the Royal family when there can have seemed but

[1] *The Exemplary Life and Character of James Bonnell, Esq.*, by William Hamilton, Archdeacon of Armagh. All quotations are from the 4th edition (London, 1718).

little hope of his ever being repaid. About 1655 he returned to England and at the Restoration his generosity was not forgotten, for "the services he had done [the Royal family], and his known Abilities for such an Employment, procur'd him a Patent to be Accomptant General of the Revenue of Ireland, his Son's Life being included in the Patent with his own". Thus the outlines of the young James Bonnell's future begin to appear. His father died in 1664, and Bonnell was fortunate in the upbringing he owed to his mother and to his schoolmaster, Tenison. At the age of fourteen he left Tenison's school in Ireland and was sent to a private school in Oxfordshire apparently to avoid the temptations of the University. Of this school Bonnell caustically observed "That in it were all the Dangers and Vices of the University, without the Advantages". Later he was entered at Catherine Hall, Cambridge (with Calamy as his tutor), and drew around him a circle of companions "suited to his own Genius and manner of Life". Hamilton notes that Bonnell was by now evolving his way of life: "Here he pursued all those Methods of Devotion he had begun before, and went on to farther degrees of religious Strictness; particularly, here he first resolved upon keeping Fasting Days, which all his Life he religiously observed." After a successful university career, he went as private tutor to the eldest son of a Mr Ralph Freeman of Aspeden Hall in Hertfordshire, whom he seems to have taught very effectively, "but his principal Aim was, to give young Mr Freeman right Notions of Religion and Virtue", thus continuing the exact methods by which the far-seeing Laudians had captured the young gentry for the Church during the interregnum and so ensuring a pro-Church Cavalier *bloc* in the Restoration Commons.[1] "Every Day their Devotions led the Way to their Studies." By his winning character Bonnell made a deep impression on his charge and finally placed the latter further in his debt by nursing him when Freeman caught the smallpox at Tours. For some years Bonnell travelled on the Continent, in Holland, Flanders, and France, partly in the family of Sir Leoline Jenkins, the ambassador, spending a year at Nimeguen, and partly in young Freeman's company. His attractive personality won the admiration and respect of this circle. There was in him, said William King, "something peculiarly shining and attractive". During much of this time his health was indifferent.

It was not until 1684 that he came to Ireland to take up the work of Accountant-General "which had been since his Father's Death manag'd by others for his Use". In this important post his ability soon gained him the esteem of the government and of his fellow-officials. There was, however, in Bonnell a world-renouncing quality, and by 1688 he was on the point of resigning his lucrative position in order to enter the ministry, when the man whom he had chosen to succeed him withdrew, fearing the trouble which everyone saw to be approaching in Ireland. This desire for ordination, as is clear from his writings, was never far from his thoughts, and persisted even in the midst of the Irish war (see his meditation for 14 November 1689). During the uncertainties and religious persecutions of

[1] Cp. R. S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*, pp. 39 f.

this time Bonnell held his post "And tho' he was one, whom the Party that then rul'd, could never hope to bring into their Interests; yet so fully were they convinc'd of his Abilities and Faithfulness, that they never thought of removing him from his Employment: For such an Openness and Sincerity shin'd in all his Actions, such unshaken Fidelity was his Rule and Guide, so known an Enemy was he to Faction and Intrigue; that he was not only free from blame, but even suspicion; and the Enemies of his Religion reverenc'd his Person". The last sentence is a testimonial to the kind of practical religion which the many devotional books of the period unanimously taught, and which was reinforced by the stress laid on the principle of edification in the liturgy.

Despite the great unsettlement of public affairs and the exodus of Churchpeople in 1689 because of the rumours of a massacre, Bonnell would not leave Dublin and boldly used his official position to protect his oppressed co-religionists. His writings at this time reflect his inner serenity. When the churches of the Church of Ireland were closed by order of the government and many of the clergy imprisoned he held firm, but the victory of the Boyne in 1690 soon brought relief, and the prisoners were released and the churches, which had been used as prisons, returned to their proper use. About this time he entered into fresh negotiations with a view to resigning his position and seeking Holy Orders, but although he eventually found a successor the business was protracted. In 1693 he married Jane Conyngham, daughter of Sir Albert Conynham, a royalist soldier. The five and a half years of his marriage were happy, for his wife shared his ideals and interests. But in 1699 the persistent ill-health which had thwarted his ambition to take Holy Orders had so weakened his resistance that he fell a sudden victim to an epidemic fever and died on 28 April in his forty-sixth year. During his last illness "Prayers and Praises were his only Language". His widow "spar'd no Pains to get his Life and Character published". Their one surviving daughter died in early childhood. Hamilton says of Bonnell that "he was Tall, well Shap'd, and Fair. His Aspect was comely, and shew'd great Sweetness, mix'd with Life and Sprightliness. There was a venerable gravity in his Look, a natural Modesty and sincere Openness." He was very far from the picture of the *dévot*, but was close to the ideal of a cultured Christian gentleman. "He had a nice Taste both in Men and Books." He spoke French fluently, was interested in music and mathematics, and had made good progress with Hebrew. He was a competent classicist and had translated some of the Greek father Synesius. Bonnell kept up with contemporary theological writing, but Hooker was his favourite divine as were à Kempis and Francis de Sales among devotional authors. Indeed, he left behind him a translation of *The Introduction to a Devout Life*, thus affording further evidence of the influence of this book in Anglican circles. "But the Holy Scriptures were his constant and daily Study; He read them, he thought them, nay, he pray'd them over too." Although many paid tribute to the charm of his conversation and to his easy manner with all sorts of people, Bonnell was not smooth and

would give a reproof when he thought it was needed. Yet "he sometimes laid the Foundation of Friendship in a Reproof". In the conduct of his business what a model for the seventeenth-century civil service he was: "And those who were oblig'd to attend him, were so treated by him, as if it had been his Duty to wait on them: It being his great study to give every one Ease and Dispatch; and none knew what Delays or Difficulties meant, where he was concern'd, or had power to remove them."

The aim of Archdeacon Hamilton in writing his *Life* of Bonnell was "to shew from him, how Beautiful Christianity is, when reduc'd to Practice; when it becomes a Rule of Life and Manners", for, using Bonnell's own papers, he tries to make of his book a study of character, fitting the inner dispositions of his subject to the outward events of his life. The framework of the biography is that of man's threefold duty to God, to his neighbour, and to himself, which is also a familiar pattern in Anglican catechetical books of the period. He reveals the daily religion of James Bonnell as that thoroughgoing, detailed Anglicanism, in which through the means of grace men were enabled to fulfil these three duties "nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita". How the strong strain of moral theology mingled with teaching on the sacraments, prayer, and meditation, is to be seen in most devotional writers of the time. The aim was to build character through worship. The fulfilment of the duties was the natural mode of expressing Christianity in practice. James Bonnell lived in this tradition. At the age of eleven his favourite book was the famous *Practice of Piety* by Lewis Bayly. What pleased him most in it was "the Proposal of a methodical Course of Religion" and he adds significantly "having been all along possess'd that it was my Duty". Right at the beginning can be discerned the familiar Caroline stamp —detail, duty, discipline. The routine of daily morning and evening prayers and careful preparation for the sacrament were among the earliest habits which Bonnell formed. His criticism of his English school was that there were infrequent celebrations of Holy Communion and what he called "morality" was absent from his tutor's sermons. It was at the university that he adopted the Church's fast days "as my bounden Duty". But the strictness of his life was far from producing in him a cold and stiff religion. The bishop of Derry could say of him "As to his Piety, it had a degree of Warmth and Zeal, that seem'd near Enthusiasm, together with all the solidarity, constancy, and regularity, that the Principles of Reason and Revelation are apt to produce in a Mind that sincerely gives it self up to be conducted by them". The devotion to the Sacred Humanity which warms Caroline religion and is to be seen in such as Taylor and Horneck is found also in his meditations. The impression he made on others was so compelling that it "stirred up many to Imitation". His cheerful and natural manner gave no hint of the strictness he used with himself. In an age not conspicuous for it, he set great store by toleration. Typical of the period is his provision of prayers for dressing and undressing, going to bed, waking and washing. In

private "His Posture was the most lowly he could contrive", but in church "he avoided everything that had the least Appearance of Affectation". On his arrival in Dublin it was his custom to communicate every fortnight, but soon he came every week. His sacramental meditations show how deeply he shared the best thought and feeling of the century. He was a keen supporter of the Religious Societies which began in Dublin about 1693, and of all charitable work.

The picture of this Accountant-General who worried lest being kept late at the office on Saturday night should interfere with his preparation for Sunday and so set a bad example to the domestic staff, is the picture of a Christian official doing his duty all the better because of a certain detachment. "He lived in the midst of much business with a mind full of composedness", said his close friend Wetenhall, bishop of Kilmore. That so many valued his friendship showed the effectiveness of his life. His contentment was only for himself and never for the poor or necessitous to whom he regularly gave away one-eighth of his income. A pleasing story of James Bonnell is that which tells how he divided among some needy ex-employees a "present" of gold left on his desk, letting it be known what he had done and why. Wetenhall, who preached his funeral sermon on "the intermediate state of blessed souls", insisted that Hamilton's readers must not think that the author had idealized his subject, and himself concluded that "In the best age of the Church on earth . . . he would have passed for a saint". Hamilton shows his own perspicacity when he wrote that Bonnell had a double significance for posterity, in that "here we have an Instance of one, who reconciled a Life of Religion and Business together", and in that if we "would behold a Church of England man . . . who honours her Laws and lives up to her Precepts . . . it is he". For Bonnell, as for Nelson, there must be rules, and what more obvious than that a Churchman should keep the Church's rules? But neither considered them as more than means to an end. There is a type of religion in which the multiplicity of regulations gives an inquirer the impression that it is just rules for rules' sake, so little connexion do they seem to have with life. Or there is that quietism which withdraws itself from the market-place, so that the inquirer feels it to be a hobby, suitable for those who like that sort of thing, but not relevant. Again, there is the modern transcendentalism, its prophetic value partly negatived by a despondent view of human effort which seems to do nothing to reinforce such ideas as duty and responsibility at a time when, as every schoolmasters' conference testifies, this is peculiarly inapposite. Two needs stand out to-day: to show the unchurched their need of religion and then to show them that religion works. Given the case of any such individual inquirer, what sort of teaching will meet his needs and situation? He may agree that man's situation is tragic and see it in terms of human pride and finiteness, but when he looks for something with which to meet the specific difficulties of his own setting it is the religion of the Church Catechism with its duties, demands, and graces, which will materially help him. For it is not that its concern with detail is an elaborate way of pretending that there is

in the world neither a human tragedy nor a sickness, but rather that the one is no excuse for not trying "to do our duty in that state of life to which it shall please God to call us", and the cure for the other depends, humanly speaking, on more people doing that very thing. If the "ohne mich" attitude is to be changed, only a religion which makes demands can change it. Hamilton's *Life* of Bonnell, which was amongst the favourite books of J. H. Shorthouse and C. Litton Falkiner, still fulfils its author's intentions for it.

H. R. McAdoo.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr Winton Thomas is Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.

Dr Warner has been Bishop of Edinburgh since 1947.

Dr Mascall is a Lecturer in Theology in the University of Oxford and Student and Tutor of Christ Church.

Dr Burleigh is Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh.

Dr McAdoo is Rector of Kilmocomogue and Canon of Kilbrittain in Cork Cathedral.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament. By H. H. Rowley. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

Isaiah 40–55. By C. R. North. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

Professor Rowley's volume is a collection of long articles, seven of which are here rescued from the obscurity of learned journals. The earliest of them, on "The Interpretation of the Song of Songs", was written in 1937–38 and is a conflation of two essays whose new form adds considerably to their comprehensiveness and weight. The latest, on "The Unity of the Book of Daniel", was first published only this year. The opening essay, a review of theories of the Suffering Servant during the last thirty years, is here presented for the first time. It is distinguished by the now familiar fairness with which the views of others are summarized and by the well-known determination to allow no shred of evidence to be unaccounted.

Much of the collection has already been absorbed into the body of scholarly opinion. Nevertheless, it would be a sad mistake to overlook the book either because much of it appears elsewhere or because it contains no startlingly new disclosures. It is one of the great merits of the author that he is always ready to tackle a question about which one suspects new viewpoints are only possible by revelation! Thus he reviews the thorny debate on the relation between "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah", "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah", the problem of levirate marriage as it presents itself in the story of "The Marriage of Ruth" (throwing so much light on the day-to-day social life of the Hebrews), "The

Nature of Old Testament Prophecy", and the relevance of recent archaeological discoveries for the historicity and interpretation of the story of the patriarchs. It is safe to say that no student of any one of the eight subjects here investigated will afford to miss Professor Rowley's book. If occasionally it suffers from the same kind of indigestion as the Bodleian Library in taking account of *everything* published (some views are better not disinterred!), it also has the same usefulness by its very comprehensiveness. In its more restricted field, it stands alongside *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, which Professor Rowley edited, and it is as indispensable.

None of the essays that have been previously published, however recently, are unrevised and the documentation has in all cases been brought up to date—that is, well beyond the date of the author's preface. In some cases this means a doubling of the footnotes. The advance apology for the inadequacy of the documentation is, of course, fantastic. The reviewer's only complaint is that whereas the writer of a learned work may justly expect his readers to navigate quotations in French and German, he really ought to help them out with the other Romance and the Scandinavian languages!

The new volume in the Torch Bible Commentaries on Second Isaiah guarantees its soundness by the name of its editor. Professor North has established for himself a leading place in the international hierarchy of Old Testament scholars mainly by his work on this very text. The only questions, therefore, which need to be put to the book before us concern its suitability for the readers intended. Professor North can rarely have been compelled to exercise such self-discipline in leaving things out. And we may venture the opinion that he has succeeded, by and large, in making himself intelligible to the "general" reader. Occasionally the essentially German expression like "self-predication" slips in, although it is hard to suggest an equally suitable equivalent. Moreover, it is at least debatable whether in the masterly "Introduction" it would not have been better to omit the "bewildering variety" of interpretations of the Suffering Servant in favour of a more sustained and therefore powerful exposition of Professor North's own view. It is surely permissible and even necessary to be a little dogmatic when there is little space for argument. Too much judicious caution is apt not to be very nourishing for the layman. Summaries are well enough when you know what is being summarized. "It takes more than tram-lines to guide a flock of sheep."

The full value of the commentary will be seen when it is used, as commentaries should be used, as a guide book to the text. The divisions are of suitable length for devotional reading, and each is given a heading which may be regarded as an accurate, informative, and attractive signpost. The headings, which are an important and integral part of the exposition, are followed by the general interpretation of the passage and then by attention to difficult expressions. The reader will do well to keep his eye constantly on the signposts. He can certainly trust his guide.

DURHAM. D. R. JONES.

ALTERATIONS TO THE TEXT OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND ACTS. By C. S. C. Williams. Blackwell. 13s. 6d.

"It is very regrettable that the textual criticism of the New Testament does not appear to appeal to the younger generation of scholars so strongly as it did to their predecessors in the nineteenth century. There seem to be lamentably few of the younger scholars who are carrying on the tradition of Lachmann and Tregelles and Tischendorf and Hort and Scrivener and Wordsworth and others of the earlier age who are still alive." So wrote Sir Frederic Kenyon in 1933. Perhaps one reason for this lack of interest is the tendency, of which the author of this book complains, to "isolate textual criticism from 'higher criticism', as though the former had little or no bearing on the latter or as if lower criticism were a barren and dry subject that can be left to specialists". That it is not a barren and dry subject this slim volume, packed full of learning and acumen, goes far to prove. Its main purpose is to question the assumption of Westcott and Hort that alterations of the text of the New Testament were rarely, if ever, made from doctrinal motives.

It would be presumptuous in a reviewer who is no specialist in this field to attempt a criticism of the more technical aspects of this book. He can only express his gratitude for a book which has stimulated his interest in the problems with which it deals. In the chapter on Doctrine and the Text of the Gospels, however, there is much to interest the non-specialist. And perhaps a few remarks on this chapter may be permitted. The writer's conclusions are, in general, conservative and usually carry conviction. I am unconvinced, however, by his defence of the generally accepted view as to the original ending of Mark. He suggests that the loss of Mark's ending was the result not of accident but of intention. When the Gospels were placed side by side in a codex, if not before, the discrepancy between Mark and the other two Synoptists would become apparent, and might have led to the mutilation of Mark. Yet the fact that it is precisely after Mark 16. 8 that the accounts of Matthew and Luke diverge seems explainable only on the supposition that Mark's ending, if it ever went beyond 16. 8, had disappeared before Matthew and Luke wrote.

Mr Williams's defence of the longer text of Luke's account of the Last Supper does not perhaps take sufficient account of the evidence of Acts. So long as our attention is confined to the text of the Gospel, our decision must turn mainly upon the question whether the addition of vv. 19b–20 to a text which had not got them or their omission from a text which had them is the more probable. But when we turn to Acts, the description given there of the "breaking of bread" seems to the present reviewer to demand some such account of the Last Supper as the shorter text provides.

Other chapters of the book discuss the influence of the texts of Marcion and Tatian and the text of Acts. An able discussion of the latter leads to the conclusion, which seems to be finding increasing support, that "any future editor of the Book of Acts will have to be eclectic in his choice of readings". Mr Williams illustrates the theo-

logical tendencies of the Western text. And, while some of the additions of this text, where they are not influenced by theological bias, may be authentic, such readings are disappointingly few, and in the main Ropes's valuation of the Western text is to be preferred to that of Clark.

H. Burnaby.

Emmanuel College,
Cambridge.

The Fourth Gospel and its Message for To-day. By W. H. Rigg. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

The title of this volume, and the publisher's advertisement inside the front dust-cover, immediately suggest a comparison with a book published in 1950, *The Religious Thought of St John*, by E. K. Lee; study of its contents shows that its similarity in aim and method is close. Both are the works of learned but non-academic clergymen, written in the scanty leisure left by their professional duties, and both are in no sense amateurish, but afford impressive evidence of wide reading and careful study. Both are studies of the theology of the Fourth Gospel, of what Mr Lee calls its "characteristic topics", and Archdeacon Rigg its "great themes". This is an impressive testimony to the practical importance of the Fourth Gospel, and to the present-day concern for a genuinely theological exposition of Scripture, in which critical problems are not indeed ignored, but definitely regarded as secondary.

It is, however, pre-eminently true of the Fourth Gospel that the critical problems have such an intimate bearing on the problems of its exegesis that they really demand a fuller treatment than they receive in Archdeacon Rigg's book. His opening chapter, entitled "A Tract for the Times", gives a good summary impression of the religious climate of the first century A.D., but is really too brief as an introduction, and contains some questionable statements. One may, for example, question whether "it is very significant that the originator of the Logos idea was the Ephesian Heraclitus", as the author states on page 24, since Heraclitus' use of "logos" gives us no help in understanding St John's.

The main themes of the Gospel are expounded in six chapters, and a final chapter discusses some characteristics of the Gospel These contain little, if anything, that is original, but are sound and well-balanced, and will certainly help their readers to understand the Gospel.

It is, however, not so obvious that the author makes good the claim implicit in his title to draw out the message of the Gospel *for to-day*. Such a task is in any case difficult, and when our author embarks upon it, as for instance in his discussion on pp. 213 ff. of the relevance of the Gospel to problems of reunion, he tends to give us little more than a sermon of his own, with no very close connexion with its text. The task which the Fourth Evangelist did for his own time has still to be done afresh for us to-day, but, even if Archdeacon

Rigg has not done it for us, his careful exposition of the teaching of the Gospel is of real value, and should be of service to anyone who studies or preaches the message of the Gospel.

J. N. Sanders.

Peterhouse,
Cambridge.

The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God. By T. H. L. Parker. Oliver and Boyd. 10s. 6d.

The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology. By Edward A. Dowey, Jr. Columbia University Press. $3.75.

The swift appearance of these books within a few weeks of each other demonstrates the force of Mr Parker's words that "Calvin is not willing to remain buried in the sixteenth century, but comes forward to carry on a theological discussion in his incisive manner with us to-day".

There could be no more delightful introduction to this discussion than that given by Mr Parker himself; for he has allowed the logic of Calvin to inspire the limpidity of his own style. Mr Dowey has come to his subject with a determination to resolve some of the points of difference in modern controversy, and some of the boulders interrupt the flow of his stream of thought.

Fundamentally the two books are at one in their belief that the fourfold division of the final edition of the *Institutes*, based upon the order of the Apostles' Creed, whilst it reflects the enrichment of Calvin's thought over the years, obscures the essential dividing line in the work; which is the difference between our knowledge of God as Creator, and our knowledge of him as Redeemer. Knowledge of our Maker, though it may come first in time, can never be saving knowledge, and it is only as redeemed that we can truly know our Creator. Even then the knowledge of the Creator is only ancillary to our salvation; "I give the name of his heart to that secret love with which God embraces us in Christ; by his hands and feet I understand those works of his which are displayed before our eyes."

Within this broad outline of agreement, there is room for much difference of interpretation regarding the respective elements that make up our knowledge of God; and the two books represent what might be roughly termed the two tendencies of contemporary evaluation. Parker sees a complete chasm between the revelation given in Nature, and that given in the Scriptures and Christ, which he calls the "Failure of Nature"; Dowey tries to infer from all the evidence in Calvin's writings that there is some tenuous kind of bridge. The issue between the two writers is a pale reflection of the Barth-Brunner controversy; though Dowey is anxious to dissociate himself from the position of either of those two antagonists.

I do not think that there will be any doubt in the mind of the reader of these two books as to which case is the more convincing. Over and over again, Parker says, Calvin seems to be making concessions to the claims of natural religion; but there is always the rub,

Si integer stetisset Adam. The shadow of the Fall renders meaningless any attempt to relate the natural man to the worship of God. This contention is irresistible; the only chink in Parker's armour is, perhaps, the accuracy of his title for the chasm. The Failure of Nature; for the failure is in man. As he says, the revelation of God in Creation seems to have been given for no positive purpose. There is an element of contradiction in the conception of a revelation that is never received; but the weakness is Calvin's own.

Dowey thinks that the double knowledge of God, as Creator and Redeemer, constitutes more than the essential division of Calvin's work, and that it is in the harmonization of these two forms of knowing that the real synthesis of the *Institutes* is to be found. From the ruins of man's misuse of Nature, he believes he has rescued the concept of law; the moral law written in the heart of man, which could not be erased by the Fall; and which Christ redeemed us to fulfil.

This is an original approach, breaking new ground for subsequent discussion. I am not quite sure that all his readers will readily accept the reasons he gives for ignoring the final order of the *Institutes*, in order to subsume the moral law under the category of God's revelation in Creation, rather than in Redemption; and it is difficult to find many passages in the text which support his contention that "We must first conceive of the law as Calvin did entirely apart from disobedience", for most of his allusions are heavy with a sense of impending disobedence, and the revelation given in conscience, like that given in Nature, serves principally to prove us "inexcusable" before God.

The strength of this conception of moral law as a positive thing lies in the hope of the future, rather than in a theoretical past; when the freely redeemed may know their Creator and keep his law. This great hope, which ends his book, needs only the caution of Parker's last paragraph; that in this life knowledge must always be "by the sacramental form of revelation".

R. R. Osborn.

Hanbury.

The Nature of the Church. Papers presented to the Theological Commission appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Edited by R. Newton Flew. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

The Church. Report of a Theological Commission on Faith and Order. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

Intercommunion. The Report of the Theological Commission appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, together with a Selection from the material presented to the Commission. Edited by Donald Baillie and John Marsh. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

The sub-titles explain sufficiently the origin of the contents of these volumes. Their purpose is that the issues raised in them should be as widely discussed as possible before the meeting at Lund this

year. It is therefore to be hoped that all who are concerned in the Ecumenical Movement will buy and study these without delay.

Care has been taken in the first volume to make the papers as authoritative as possible, and not merely the expression of an individual's own opinions. "The Doctrine of the Church as held and taught in the Church of England" is a masterly compilation from the Articles and Book of Common Prayer of extracts bearing on the questions which were put before each contributor. Whether the resulting lack of the warmth, which is so noticeable in other replies, is altogether a gain may be a matter of opinion. But its dispassion and balance are as valuable as the desire to understand differing points of view on the one side, and the equally sincere desire not to be misunderstood on the other, are obvious in other papers. Professor Alivisatos's article is a particularly useful contribution, while, if an opinion may be allowed, Dr Flew's exposition of the Roman Catholic position is as brilliant as it is fair.

The Report *The Church* summarizes the most important differences as "beliefs held, by or within some communions, about the limits of the Church, and the mode of its definition, the continuity of the Church, the unity of the Church, the sacraments and their relation to membership of the Church, the nature of the authority of the Church, the relation of the Church to the Kingdom of God, and the question of priesthood".

Whether or no the subsequent discussion of some of these beliefs adds anything to their elucidation may be doubted, and the Report seems overweighted with its references to present trends of thought and the Ecumenical Movement itself. But it would have done lasting service to the cause of truth if its use of the word "Communions" instead of "Churches" could become general.

This point is brought out by several writers in the volume *Intercommunion*, especially by Fr Congar. Much of the intensity of feeling in some of these papers may be due, not only to understandable impatience, but also to the ambiguous use of the word "Church". The word "Communions" is a truer description than the word "Churches" of those fellowships of Christians which stretch across the world, intertwining with each other yet distinct. It helps us also to see that the question of "Intercommunion" does not concern the actions of certain individuals, when assembled for Conferences or Reunions, or out of touch with their own Communions. Their actions are, or should be, the reflection of their Communion as a whole, and the question is raised: "Can there be, in sincerity, a fitful, partial, spasmodic *inter-communion*?"

The Report is a very fair summary of the views that were placed before the Commission and leaves the matter much where it was found, without settling or recommending anything. For this we can be thankful. But it may be wondered whether the emotional tinge which is to be found in so much of this volume is altogether real and accurate. How far are our divisions sinful and tragic? Granted that in their origin there was sin in all those concerned and in their words and actions. But were the divisions themselves outside the

divine ordering? Could the Western Church have served its Lord in bringing such order and refinement in Europe, without itself abandoning that structure with which it was endowed and which could only function while it was informed by holiness and coinherent love? Could the Reformers have asserted their several insights and recoveries without embodying them in some distinct organism and asserting its independence, things being as they were?

When so many of us are busy trying to develop the parish meeting of the Congregationalists; or the parish Communion at which the Wesleys would have been entirely at home; or the ascetic life of the Counter-Reformation's spiritual guides, or the freer, more expansive devotional life of Orthodoxy, we may find it difficult to assess the tragedy of divisions. There is a mystery in separations as in unions. Certainly it is unwise to make painful feelings a ground for relaxing disciplines that are rooted in deep theological distinctions. Nor is it wise to seek to place the *onus probandi* on any one party to the discussion, as Professor Greenslade would do, in an otherwise temperately reasoned paper. The burden of weighing and testing rests on all alike, and none should seek to shift its weight.

It also does not help the discussion to suggest that those who maintain the necessity of an episcopally ordained priest for a valid Eucharist are interposing a "notion" which bars the way to reunion. It prompts the reply: "When you invite all those who love the Lord Jesus to partake of the Sacrament, do they love the Lord or their notion of him?" And this begins again the whole argument on authority and the divine provision for man's assurance.

We may welcome the wisdom of the *Report on Intercommunion* which counsels restraint from actions which would lead to further demands—"If this, why not that?"—and concentrates our attention on the mutual understandings of those treasures which all and each severally possess. Impatience may make such growth in understanding impossible.

Lyng Rectory,
Norwich.

E. P. Field.

Ecumenism and Catholicity. By W. Nicholls. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

The Ecumenical Movement. By L. Hodgson. University Press, Sewanee. N.p.

Church and Chapel. By R. A. Edwards. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 8s. 6d.

Christianity and the Reconciliation of the Nations. By C. H. Dodd. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

The report of Section I of the Amsterdam Assembly presented clearly the dilemma which besets all Church relations and discussions. In no small measure this was the result of the theological dialogue carried on within the Section by Professor Karl Barth and Professor Michael Ramsey. As a result theological discussions concerning Church Unity were seen in a new light by no means welcome to those whose thinking still moved in terms of progress and steps to

unity. For, "whenever we find ourselves thus speaking of our unity, we also find ourselves faced by some stubborn problems. In dealing with them we discover disagreements which are to be traced back to our different ways of understanding the whole, and beneath these disagreements we find agreement in a unity which drew us together and will not let us go". This report cut away much of the optimism which had arisen from quantitative assessments of agreements in this or that sphere of doctrine, thus making the sphere of disagreement seem small and perhaps unimportant. It made clear that the deep antinomy between Catholic and Protestant affected not certain selected fields of doctrine but the wholeness of doctrine. Equally the report and the discussions which led up to it make it more clear than ever before that agreement and disagreement were so inextricably bound together that in our very disagreement we did not pass outside the unity which is given to the Church in Christ.

No doubt this dialectic will be continued at Lund, and both in England and in America many books have appeared which contribute to the debate which the official delegates of the Church must continue when they meet at Lund for the Third World Conference of Faith and Order. For those who wish to know and understand the Ecumenical Movement as a factor to be reckoned with in modern Church politics, Professor Leonard Hodgson's three lectures to the University of the South, Sewanee, are wholly admirable. With the clarity which his readers expect, the history of the movement in its three important stages, 1910–37, 1937–48, 1948–50, is clearly depicted, and through it all runs the author's conviction "that we are witnessing the opening of a new period in Church history".

But the history which Professor Hodgson records has not led to an easy-going inter-denominationalism as many foretold. On the contrary, those who have been most aware of a deep unity in Christ with those Christians from whom they were divided have at the same time been driven to take seriously and re-examine the tenets of their own confessional loyalty. Some, it is true, have escaped the pain by dissociating themselves from the scandal of disunity, but most have seen that this is no Christian answer. For all who are aware of this painful antinomy in which divided Christians are involved, Mr Nicholls' book is of the greatest importance. He writes as one who until recently was an orthodox Anglo-Catholic. He set out to understand and interpret the Ecumenical Movement theologically, and in so doing finds that many of his own principles are challenged. This is by far the most useful and stimulating book of its kind which has appeared in this country. His essay is based on the premise that "in our ecumenical meeting with one another we find a unity which already exists, a unity which was set up by Jesus Christ in redeeming the world; something massive and objective which even our sin cannot break". How is this unity to be found; in the exclusive claims of Rome or the Orthodox Church; the branch theory of High Anglicanism—or the fragmentation of Protestantism? Mr Nicholls does not attempt to wrestle with this problem in the outmoded terms of progress, but in terms of history and eschatology. Indeed he shows

that the fundamental difference between Christians is their understanding of the relation of history and eschatology, the Kingdom present and the Kingdom to come. There is much in the book which will stimulate thought, much that will either clarify the situation for the reader or provoke sharp disagreement. The examination of his own position is honest and candid, and one from which the Catholic thinking of the Church of England might greatly benefit. For "the Church of England cannot be justified in terms of Roman presuppositions. If it can be justified, it must be from different presuppositions altogether." Not all would agree with Mr Nicholls' practical conclusions, but every reader will find in this book a challenge to his own thinking and a further incentive to prayer for the unity of the Holy Catholic Church.

In contrast, Canon Edwards' book is frankly disappointing: he does not seem to be aware either of the agreements or disagreements in Christian unity which lie behind the existence of Church and Chapel. Inevitably the subject is dealt with in a manner which neither commends the Church nor displays the true nature of the Chapel.

Lastly, Professor Dodd takes the theme of Unity, examining it in the light of its Biblical use with the realism which we should expect. In the Ecumenical Movement he finds a significant reminder to Christians and to the world of the vocation of the Church to be an instrument of reconciliation.

KENNETH DORCHESTER.

A HISTORY OF THE CURE OF SOULS. By John T. McNeill. S.C.M. Press. 25s.

The parish priest or local minister will be disappointed who hopes to find here what he may reasonably expect to find in a work with such a title—some account of the history of his craft. To qualify for more than the barest mention it is almost necessary for the person noticed to have written a book or at the least to have had his letters published. Thus in a chapter entitled "The Cure of Souls in Roman Catholicism", largely devoted to the French, a glance at the Curé d'Ars is oddly introduced with the words, "We may permit ourselves a reference to the celebrated parish saint", but this is preceded by the significant remark that "to find evidence of how the common people were served . . . we should have to go to the records of parish life and the task of research would be enormous". One cannot but regret that the author, who is Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, New York, did not devote to that task some of the immense study which must have gone to the making of this book, for a history of the cure of souls in which the day-to-day life of the Local Church is so largely ignored inevitably provides an inadequate and distorted picture. But pray, Sir, where are the pastors? And where, apart from such favoured beings as caught the eye of a Luther or a Fénelon, are the sheep?

This said, it must be recorded that the book is within its range a

veritable encyclopedia and that, notably in the account of the Kirk, it contains some attractive writing. The net is cast wide to include "The Faiths of Asia" and the philosophers of Greece and Rome, and this is salutary, not least because one is rebuked to remember how often as a Christian pastor one has dispensed in less felicitous prose mere Ciceronian platitudes. The chapter on the Celtic Church makes one wish the more that some scholar would provide us with what, unless we are mistaken, does not exist—a really good handbook on that subject. To the Anglican Communion Professor McNeill pays this handsome tribute—"It is probably safe to say that no other great communion has given more attention to the cure of souls, either in theory or in practice." This being so, it is strange that he should omit all reference to the tremendous charge addressed in the Prayer Book Ordinal to those about to be ordained priests, which gives (and long may it continue to give!) our priesthood a primarily pastoral emphasis.

But the great value of this book for Anglicans will be found in the wide conspectus which from its own particular angle it provides of the antecedents of other Christian bodies of which most of us still know so woefully little. Here one meets what one has met often of late—a Luther, a Calvin, a Knox, very different from the Luther, Calvin, and Knox, of our traditional pictures. Here one is surprised (and some will be shocked) to learn that Richard Baxter, like a recent Church of England report, permitted gambling so long as its motive was sport and not covetousness. The whole book is notably fair and, for all its somewhat limited interpretation of "cure of souls", which at times it seems without due discrimination to link up with psychotherapy, anyone who works through it will find his horizon broadened and his store of knowledge enlarged. It is interesting to notice on page 225 the expression "stricken out" surviving in the New World, where we in the Old would now write "struck".

WIGAN. FRANK BENNETT.

FATHER DOUGLASS OF BEHALA BY SOME OF HIS CLOSEST FRIENDS. Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.

Here is a glorious biography, full of anecdote, about a glorious man and saint. Yet he is no plaster saint. The outstanding characteristics of Frederick Wingfield Douglass, of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, were his physical fitness, his courage, his charm, and his love. Starting by stroking his college to head of the river and only missing his "blue" because he would not stay on at Oxford another year, at the age of eighty-three he was still bicycling once a week through the porous heat of Calcutta the five miles between his "cage" at Behala and the Mission House, and back again. Bishop Westcott, another octogenarian, used to boast of the healthiness of Calcutta, pointing to himself and "Father D.". "Survival of the fittest" was the more common explanation. "That chap looks as if he had just come from a hard campaign" was a General's comment, and it was true; he was Christ's soldier, and he kept himself "hard" for Christ's

sake. And his courage matched his strength. He almost made a hobby of rescuing people; his tutor on a mountaineering expedition, a policeman during his first curacy, Father Brown, weighing twenty stone, and immersed in a taxi at the bottom of a large pond (called "tank" in Bengal), two soldiers when a chaplain in France, for which he got his M.C., and so on, ending with a drowning soldier at the age of seventy-two and repeated efforts to save another one when seventy-six. And his courage was equalled by his charm. "We could not resist him", wrote his tutor, of his Oxford days, nor could the East, whether Indian or British. "He goes like a 'rail-gari' ", said a coolie, who could not keep up with him, and equally by his charm he took Calcutta and Barisal students, and later British soldiers and sailors, viceroys, governors, and business men, by storm. There was a continuous stream of Indian converts, among them a Brahmin who was to found St Andrew's Brotherhood, and a terrorist who confessed his crime. Learning Christianity from him was always costly. For the last twenty years of his life, as he did not come into Calcutta apart from his weekly visit to the Mission House, the European part of Calcutta went out to him in his little open thatched hut by the side of the road, to share with him their confessions and their confidences. And the secret of it all was his great love, expressed in the simple beauty of the chapel that he built in Behala and its worship and in the music of his boys' orchestra, and in his humble and touching belief in the countless souls that he won to Christ, Bengali and British. "'He always gave the impression that you were the one person in the world he was wanting to meet."

This book is one to have and to lend. It is the story of a great Englishman (in the "quit India" riots when nearly eighty he rode home on punctured flat tyres rather than admit himself defeated!) and of a great saint in a great Brotherhood. There are few biographies which can compare with it either in interest or in vividness.

BRISTOL. J. R. PEACEY.

LEISURE THE BASIS OF CULTURE. By Josef Pieper. Translated by A. Dru, with an introduction by T. S. Eliot. Faber. 10s. 6d.

This book consists of two essays, one with the title of the book and the other entitled "The Philosophical Act". Dr Pieper belongs to the Catholic world, and in these essays quite plainly takes his stand on traditional Catholic categories; but he also possesses the vigour and precision characteristic of German thinking. His book has none of the aridity and juggling with inert concepts which are sometimes apparent in neo-thomist writing. For he is a philosopher rather than an exponent of revealed truth or traditional concepts. The essay on leisure is so fresh and so profound that it is hard to believe that Dr Pieper has ever heard of the thousands of other essays written on the same theme.

The distinctions he expounds are in themselves able to open whole hidden perspectives of thought. For instance, Leisure = *skole* = *scola* = school; work = *a-skole* = *neg-otium* = un-leisure. Leisure is the still

centre of being. Knowledge is not simply the labour of the discursive reason (*ratio*) alone, but is *ratio+intellectus* or simple intuition.

As he unfolds his argument on the basis of these distinctions it becomes apparent that what he says—whether it is about grace as something given, as the foundation of Christian understanding; or about *being* as the goal of man's life; or about the nature of philosophy as wonder—has a very keen relation to modern social and political attitudes. In other words, Dr Pieper is philosophizing in the great tradition of the West, related to, yet not bound by, the current scene.

If it is permissible to make use of an illustration not taken from Dr Pieper's own work, I cannot doubt that he would be intensely amused and stirred by the story of the educational inspector who refused to make a certain English cathedral school eligible for State aid, on the grounds that it devoted too much of its time to "music and other non-educational activities". But Dr Pieper would not readily use any topical evidence to grind any political, far less ecclesiastical, axe. There is, of course, more than a hint of the stress of actual events in his thought: the elaboration of the thought of "intellectual workers" in a totalitarian society is clearly affected by the trend of events in East Germany. But even here his analysis of the relation of work to the true being of man has a wider framework and a deeper purpose than passing polemics. In general, the philosophy of Being which he here hints at has rarely been so attractively suggested. The difference between this and all other philosophies goes into the heart of all our differences both theological and political. It is the unagreed problem of what man is to which Dr Pieper in this book offers the way towards an answer. It is exciting to find distinct resemblances in this sphere between the Catholic and Tillich the Protestant thinker.

There is space only to illustrate the fructifying nature of Dr Pieper's thought by reference to another realm—that of the Ecumenical Movement, of which Dr Pieper has, however, nothing to say. Since C. H. Dodd's letter on "non-theological factors" which hinder Church reunion, much has been made of the point. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion, however, that even the non-theological differences stem from earlier hidden theological differences. For Dr Pieper it is the view of man, and of his relation to grace and to Being, which lies behind certain broad cultural differences among denominations. For culture, as he is so fond of saying, is linked with the *cultus*, with divine worship, and is the "quintessence of all the natural goods of the world beyond the sphere of what is immediately useful to man".

Let us hope that Mr Eliot can be encouraged to give us more of Dr Pieper. In particular, it would be an advantage to have a fuller discussion of the relation of philosophy to theology—a theme which has lain dormant for so long that even Dr Pieper's remarks in the second essay do not take us very far.

Four words about the translation: *o si sic omnes!*

London. R. Gregor Smith.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

AUGUSTINE PRESS: Walton Hannah, *Darkness Visible: a revelation and interpretation of Freemasonry* [A much amplified version of the author's article "Should a Christian be a Freemason?"] (12s. 6d.).

BOWES AND BOWES: P. V. Pistorius, *Plotinus and Neoplatonism* (21s.).

BURNS OATES: H. Thurston, S.J., *The Physical Phenomena of Mysticism* (35s); K. Kendall (Ed.), *Spiritual Teaching of Father Steuart, S.J.* (16s.); J. Rickaby, S.J., *The Lord my Light* (16s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: P. Carnegie Simpson, *The Fact of Christ* [New Edn.] (4s. 6d.); Henry Suso, *The Life of the Servant* (7s. 6d.).

EAST AND WEST LIBRARY: Martin Buber, *Israel and Palestine* (18s.).

HARVILL PRESS: Max Picard, *The World of Silence* (12s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Maisie Spens, *Receive the Joyfulness of your Glory* (15s.).

HUTCHINSONS: E. O. James, *Marriage and Society* (18s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: W. L. Bradley, *P. T. Forsyth: The Man and his Work* (18s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: Frank Houghton, *If We Believe* (3s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Emil Brunner, *The Misunderstanding of the Church* (10s. 6d.); J. G. Davies, *Daily Life in the Early Church* (16s.); Marcus L. Loane, *Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession* (12s. 6d.).

MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE: Nicholas (Metropolitan of Krutitzy and Kolomna), *We will Defend Peace!* (n.p.).

NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING CO. (AMSTERDAM): R. M. Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law* (n.p.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: N. Micklem, *The Tree of Life and other verses* (7s. 6d.).

PATERNOSTER PUBLICATIONS: Linwood Sleigh, *St Etheldreda's and Ely Place* (4s. 6d.).

REINHARDT (MUNICH): *Das neue Mariendogma im Lichte der Geschichte und im Urteil der Oekumene* (D.M. 5).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: B. Yeaxlee, *Religion in the Nation's Schools* (1s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Karl Jaspers, *Reason and Anti-Reason in our Time* (7s. 6d.); Martin Buber, *Right and Wrong: an interpretation of some psalms* (6s.).

SCRIBNERS (NEW YORK): Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Irony of American History* ($2.50).

SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY: *Book List 1952* [Particulars and short reviews of books on O.T. and allied subjects] (5s.).

S.P.C.K.: T. S. Eliot, *The Value and Use of Cathedrals in England To-day* (1s.); *Church Commissioners for England (Report)* (1s.); G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (21s.); Thomas Wood, *English Casuistical Divinity during the Seventeenth Century* (12s. 6d.); A. R. Browne-Wilkinson, *The Prayer Book Way of Preparation for Confirmation* (2s.).

S.P.C.K. AND LONGMANS GREEN: Charles Kingsley Williams (Ed.), *The New Testament—A New Translation in Plain English* (8s. 6d.).

UNIVERSITY OF CAROLINA PRESS: J. C. O'Flaherty, *Unity and Language: A Study in the Philosophy of Johann Georg Hamann* (n.p.).

VERLAG FERDINAND SCHÖNINGH (PADERBORN): R. Schimmelpfennig, *Die Geschichte der Marienverehrung im deutschen Protestantismus* (n.p.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZÜRICH): Fritz Tanner, *Die Ehe im Pietismus* (Fr. 11.95); G. W. Locher, *Die Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis im Lichte seiner Christologie* (Fr. 1145).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher